

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
WESTERN DIVISION

| | | |
|----------------------|---|----------------------|
| WARREN EASTERLING, | : | |
| Plaintiff, | : | |
| v. | : | Case No. 3:14-cv-226 |
| JUDGE DALE CRAWFORD, | : | JUDGE WALTER H. RICE |
| Defendant. | : | |

DECISION AND ENTRY ADOPTING UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM JUDGMENT (DOC. #49); OVERRULING PLAINTIFF'S OBJECTIONS THERETO (DOC. #50); OVERRULING PLAINTIFF'S "MOTION FOR RELIEF OF JUDGMENT (RULE 60b3)" (DOC. #48); JUDGMENT TO ENTER IN FAVOR OF DEFENDANT AND AGAINST PLAINTIFF; CASE TO REMAIN TERMINATED ON DOCKET

On December 14, 2015, the Court issued a Decision and Entry Adopting Report and Recommendations of the United States Magistrate Judge in their Entirety, and Overruling Plaintiff's Third Motion for Relief from Judgment. Doc. #47. The Court explained, once again, that, contrary to Plaintiff's belief, federal question jurisdiction does not trump the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine and/or the Supremacy Clause. This prompted Plaintiff to file a fourth Motion for Relief from Judgment, Doc. #48, once again arguing that the Court is legally incorrect, is biased against him, and is conspiring to violate his rights.

On January 4, 2016, United States Magistrate Judge Michael R. Merz issued a Report and Recommendations, Doc. #49, recommending that Plaintiff's fourth motion be denied for the same reasons that the previous motions were denied. He notes that Plaintiff has refused to seek appellate review, and recommends that the Court use its authority under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11 to sanction Plaintiff and put a stop to the abuse of the judicial process.


Plaintiff filed timely Objections to the Report and Recommendations, Doc. #50, reiterating the same arguments that the Court has repeatedly rejected. For reasons previously given, the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendations (Doc. #49) are ADOPTED in their entirety, Plaintiff's Objections (Doc. #50) are OVERRULED, and Plaintiff's fourth Motion for Relief of Judgment (Doc. #48) is OVERRULED.

Plaintiff is strongly cautioned that additional frivolous filings in this Court concerning the applicability of the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine will, very likely, result in the imposition of Rule 11 sanctions. This is true not only in the above-captioned case, but in each of the many duplicative cases that Plaintiff has filed in this Court. If Plaintiff disagrees with this Court's rulings, he may file a timely appeal with the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals.

Judgment shall be entered in favor of Defendant and against Plaintiff.

The captioned case shall remain terminated on the Court's docket.

Date: March 23, 2016



WALTER H. RICE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE